

pollution and has prevented more than 400,000 premature deaths. In fact, it has helped to cut ground-level ozone by more than 25 percent since 1980 and reduced mercury emissions by 45 percent since 1990. If that isn't enough, the economic value of these improvements is estimated to reach almost \$2 trillion by the year 2020.

The recently announced Clean Power Plan offers us the opportunity we need to continue to better protect public health. It is projected to contribute to significant ozone pollution reductions, resulting in important benefits including avoiding up to 3,600 premature deaths, 90,000 asthma attacks in children, and 1,700 heart attacks.

However, the continued effects of climate change and our inability to act are impairing our continued progress. Climate change is creating conditions that make it harder for us to clean up our air and reduce pollution. Without addressing one problem, we eliminate our progress on another.

Unfortunately, Members of this body use every opportunity possible to attack the Clean Air Act and now the Clean Power Plan. These unprecedented assaults block, weaken, or delay a host of long overdue clean air safeguards. As my colleagues continue to stand in our own way, we are harming the environment and ultimately hurting ourselves.

Mr. Speaker, climate change is a direct threat to humanity, and it is time we reexamine how we can think about it, talk about it, and respond to this growing problem. We may be part of the problem, but we also have the unique opportunity to become part of the solution.

I think Pope Francis put it best when he said: "Yet all is not lost. Human beings, while capable of the worst, are also capable of rising above themselves, choosing again what is good, and making a new start."

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to heed these wise words and make a choice to act on climate change to protect our health. We cannot afford to wait any longer.

#### FEDERAL CONTRACTORS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. HARDY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in order to express my deep concern and disapproval of how the Obama administration has continued their assault on Federal and private contractors.

Since taking office, the President has signed a total of 13 executive orders that directly focus on Federal contracting, all of which establish new labor requirements and impose additional financial burdens on contractors. When you also include the 16 new regulations that have been created from these orders, a large portion of contractors who were once able to compete for Federal contracts are now

being forced out due to these new hurdles.

In fact, the number of small contractors who submit bids for Federal contracts have declined by more than 100,000 since 2013. This is unacceptable. While these mandates range from forcing contractors to provide additional employee benefits to being required to report additional information during the bidding process, the one thing that each of these new directives has in common is that it will make it more difficult for small contractors to compete for Federal contracts. A prime example is the executive order known as the Fair Pay and Safe Workplaces, which the President signed in July 2014. While intended to award Federal contracts only to responsible contractors who have not committed recent labor violations, the actual outcome will lead to additional reporting requirements, increased administrative costs, and the potential for a contractor to be blacklisted from bidding on Federal contracts while they prove that they are innocent from the accused infraction.

Mr. Speaker, by using executive orders to bypass congressional authority, this is nothing more than an attempt by this administration to implement their agenda without regard for the negative impact it will have on businesses and industries. But, unfortunately, this agenda extends beyond Federal contractors. The recent National Labor Relations Board ruling in the Browning-Ferris Industries case, which is more widely known as the joint employer decision, will have a massive impact on the business relationships between contractors and their subcontractors, franchisors and franchisees, and other contract labor relations.

In one politically motivated decision, the NLRB completely redefined the definition of "joint employer" when they determined that a company could be held liable for a labor violation committed by a subcontractor or a staffing agency that they hired, even if this company doesn't have direct supervision over those workers.

This sharing of responsibility is nothing more than an attempt to force both parties into collective bargaining, but the result will be much worse. Franchisors may decide that it is in their best interest to assert more authority over their franchisees to make sure that labor violations are less likely to occur, but then other franchisors may decide it is more cost effective to end their relationship as a way to avoid potential issues. Essentially, the same results could occur with companies who hire staffing agencies or independent contractors to provide them with temporary employees or contractors who hire subcontractors to perform skilled labor.

As a small business contractor for more than two decades, I understand the unique relationship between a contractor and a subcontractor. In the

end, the joint employer decision will disrupt this relationship and potentially discourage future contract arrangements.

Mr. Speaker, I ask for my colleagues to join with me in demanding this administration to stop continually adding burdens to our Federal and private contractors.

#### RACISM AND VOTING RIGHTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GUTIERREZ) for 5 minutes.

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Mr. Speaker, I rewatched recently one of my favorite movies. "Selma" tells the story of the fight to register voters in Selma, Alabama, culminating in the march from Selma to Montgomery, led by Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., in 1965. Spoiler alert: After being turned around, threatened, beaten, tear-gassed, and killed, Black people got to vote in America.

A young and handsome JOHN LEWIS is depicted in the pivotal role of the community organizer who helps lead the movement. Another spoiler alert: JOHN is a Member of this body and serves with distinction from the State of Georgia.

It is among the highest honors of my life to know JOHN LEWIS and to work with him. In fact, I have marched with him and gotten arrested with JOHN LEWIS outside this Capitol Building in our fight for immigration reform.

I highly recommend the movie, and I want every citizen—and every person who lives here and hopes to become a citizen one day—to watch and learn from the movie "Selma." It is a moment in history when voting and citizenship were literally life-and-death struggles—and it was only 50 years ago.

And just yesterday, the NAACP completed a historic 1,000-mile march from Selma to Washington to remind us how we must always stand up to bullies and official inaction using nonviolence and community organizing and empowerment techniques.

The way to respond to racism is to vote. I have been thinking a lot about that recently as the Republican Presidential field of candidates has fallen in line with a bully who spews racism and is leading among his party's primary voters.

What can Americans do when the tail wagging the dog of the Republican Party is saying that most Mexicans are murderers and rapists?

What can we do as a nation when candidates blame unrest in reaction to police violence in Baltimore and Ferguson on Mexican and Central American immigrants?

What can we do when thousands of people cheer when a candidate proposes building a great wall of America on our southern border, and the response from other candidates is to say that we should build another wall opposite Canada as well?

Well, in the movie "Selma," Oprah Winfrey didn't just get mad; she fought